


North West Cambridge Masterplanning Workshop and Public Exhibitions

Consultation Report

July 2010



North West Cambridge Masterplanning 'Refresh' Workshop and Public Exhibitions

Prepared by: 
Helen Inman
Planner

Checked by: 
Heather Topel
Director

Approved by: 
Heather Topel
Director

Rev No	Comments	Checked by	Approved by	Date
1		Helen Inman	Heather Topel	27 th July

Telephone: Fax: Website: <http://www.aecom.com>

Job No
9400217

Reference

27th July 2010

This document is confidential and the copyright of AECOM Europe Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Stakeholder Workshop	4
3.	Public Exhibitions	11
4.	Conclusions.....	15
5.	Appendices.....	16

1 Introduction

Context and Purpose of this Report

- 1.1 The University of Cambridge has ambitious plans for its North West Cambridge site to help it retain its position as one of the world's finest universities. In creating a masterplan that meets the University's forecast needs and high standards, the University has been keen to involve all of the local communities. The University genuinely wants to benefit from input from stakeholders and the public to ensure that the new community integrates seamlessly with its neighbours.
- 1.2 The last consultation, in November 2009, helped to refine and improve the University's ideas and many of the issues raised by the public and key stakeholders have already been incorporated into the emerging plans. The University has consulted again on the 29th June (stakeholder and public exhibition sessions) and 3rd July (public exhibition) in order to outline how the masterplan has responded to key issues addressed in the previous consultation, and to establish the stakeholder and community viewpoints on its latest thinking, as the University continues to improve the masterplan for the site.
- 1.3 The University owns 140 hectares of land to the north west of the city of Cambridge. The site is bounded by the M11, the A14, Huntingdon road and Madingley Road. The eastern boundary of the site consists of large residential dwellings fronting Huntingdon Road (A1307). The southern boundary along Madingley Road (A1303) consists of a mix of residential dwellings, Colleges, University facilities and a Park & Ride, managed by the County Council. At present the site accommodates the University farm and out buildings, other University research facilities and arable farmland, which includes a site of special scientific interest (SSSI) and areas of ecological value.
- 1.4 The site has the potential to make a significant contribution to new collegiate accommodation and research facilities that the University requires over the coming years, and in particular to meet the need for affordable housing for University and college staff (key worker housing). The University recognises the complexity and magnitude of the proposed development at North West Cambridge, and therefore feels it is essential to undertake an extensive and collaborative consultation process, hence consultation periods in November 2009 and again in June and July 2010. This consultation process has occurred throughout masterplan preparation and evolution, and consultation will also be undertaken as part of the statutory process of submitting an outline planning application. A series of masterplan proposals for the NW Cambridge site will be put forward, subject to technical review and approval by the University.
- 1.5 Furthermore, this transparent approach allows key stakeholders to be involved in the formative stages of the masterplan and can gain a thorough understanding of the requirements and issues. Engagement in the various consultation processes also provides stakeholders with the potential to influence the masterplan development process.
- 1.6 This collaborative approach to plan making, fully supported and encouraged by the Government, as part of PPS12, mitigates potential conflict through discussion. It thereby results in a masterplan which has 'buy-in' from the various stakeholders, as the University has clearly outlined how the masterplan has responded to key issues raised in previous consultation. The outputs from the collaborative workshop and public exhibition will inform where possible, the masterplan evolution prior to submission of an outline planning application, which is likely to be submitted in early 2011.
- 1.7 This report summarises the process and outcomes of the June 2010 consultation process. This consisted of the following events:
 1. Stakeholder Workshop- 29th June 2010 (daytime)
 2. Public Exhibition – 29th June 2010 (evening)
 3. Public Exhibition – 3rd July 2010 (daytime)

- 1.8 This report, prepared by the consultant team, provides an account of the proceedings and summarises the outputs of these events.
- 1.9 This report is structured as follows:
- Part 2 sets out an overview of the stakeholder 'refresh' workshop and the outcomes of the workshop
 - Part 3 sets out the events of the public exhibitions
 - Part 4 concludes the consultation report and outlines next steps in the masterplan process
 - Part 5 provides appendices that schedule the full list of invitees and attendees, as well as detailed feedback received

Workshop Aims

- 1.10 The Masterplan 'refresh' Workshop was held on the 29th June 2010 and allowed interested parties to understand how the scheme has moved on from the previous consultation, and to review the key parameters for development. The potential constraints, opportunities and aspirations were also refreshed in people's minds through a series of break out group sessions. This process ensures engagement with key stakeholders and encourages innovative solutions to issues such as transport, sustainability, mixed uses, urban form and design. The aim of the workshop was to outline the proposals for the masterplan that were of the highest design quality, based on local constraints and urban design principles, and to show how some of these have moved forward since the last consultation. The emphasis is on developing creative solutions to opportunities and problems specific to the site.
- 1.11 The June and July 2010 consultation process involved a stakeholder workshop, to which a variety of stakeholders were invited, including representatives from Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge County Council and representatives from organisations including Natural England, Cambridgeshire Horizons, Sustrans, EDF Energy, Sport England, Go East, English Heritage East of England, Environment Agency, Transport providers, Local Environmental Groups and Residents Associations. The full list of organisations invited can be found in Appendix 5.1 and the schedule of workshop participants is included in Appendix 5.3.

Public Exhibition Aims

- 1.12 The aim of the public exhibition was to give the local public an opportunity to put forward their aspirations and opinions, raising any issues and concerns. The public consultation boards provided an overview of the concerns raised in previous consultation and how the masterplan has responded to these issues.
- 1.13 In turn, the process enabled the University and the consultant team to inform the public on the masterplanning process to date. The public exhibition provides key inputs into the formulation of the final masterplan iteration for North West Cambridge. When the planning application for the scheme is submitted Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council will conduct formal statutory consultation, which will provide other opportunities for further consultation and discussion of the masterplan.

Key Outputs for the Workshops and Public Exhibitions

- 1.14 The objective of the workshop and public exhibitions was to provide a 'refresh' for key stakeholders and the public on the masterplan proposals, the parameters of the development and to outline the project process to date, focussing on refining the principles and parameters for the emerging masterplan.
- 1.15 The objective of the June and July 2010 consultation process was to achieve the following outputs:
- Outline development and design principles for NW Cambridge
 - Review masterplan development to date
 - Highlight the masterplan response to consultation
 - Identify issues for further development to be considered as part of the masterplan, where possible, prior to submission of the OPA
- 1.16 The workshop and public exhibitions held in June and July 2010 were feedback sessions to engage with stakeholders and the public and demonstrate how issues have been tested through the development of the masterplan.



2 Stakeholder Workshop

Workshop overview

- 2.1 The intention of the Stakeholder masterplan 'refresh' Workshop was to allow interested parties to understand how the scheme had moved on from the previous consultation, and to review the key parameters for development. In addition, the aim was to discuss key principles and parameters of the Masterplan and inform participants of the masterplan process to date and the timetable going forward for submission of an outline planning application. The Stakeholder Workshop was held on the 29th June 2010.
- 2.2 The workshop began with introductory comments from Roger Taylor, project director for the North West Cambridge site representing the University, and from Charles Ledward, project principal on the AECOM consultancy team for masterplan development. This was followed by a presentation by Jonathan Rose of the AECOM consultancy team and two themed group workshop sessions.
- 2.3 The first breakout session focussed on theme groups, who discussed the masterplan response to key site issues. The first break out session concluded with the participants re-assembling to present the findings of the break out session and to discuss these with the wider group.
- 2.4 The second part of the day included focussing on various options for different areas within the site, and key issues including local centre, open space, creating neighbourhoods and streetscape, the Ridgeway and wider connectivity. The second break out session concluded with the participants re-assembling to present the findings of the break out session and to discuss these with the wider group.
- 2.5 The day concluded with the participants re-assembling to present the findings of the Workshop sessions and to discuss these with the wider group. Conclusions and next steps were then outlined by the consultant team. The Workshops were attended by approximately 65 stakeholders (see Appendix 5.3) including representatives from the three local authorities, from statutory bodies, stakeholder organisations and local residents associations.

Introduction to the workshop sessions

- 2.6 The introduction to the workshop sessions provided a 'refresh' of the University objectives and role in North West Cambridge and explained the nature and reasons for the consultation process. The opening statement also informed participants of the progression of the masterplan and introduced the masterplanning team and supporting technical consultants. The University also highlighted its commitment to creating a successful, sustainable, mixed-use community. The University is committed to creating buildings and public spaces of high quality design and to preparing a high quality masterplan for North West Cambridge as part of a collaborative process.

AECOM Consultation Presentation –Masterplan Evolution

2.7 The consultant team delivered a presentation on the following:

- Masterplanning purpose and goals
 - Masterplan evolution since 2005
 - Introduction to the Masterplanning team
 - Aims of the Workshops and programme for the events
- Project context, including the planning context of the site;
- Site context, including key landscape characteristics, such as Storey's Field which is akin to Parkers Piece, and the SSSI;
- Energy and Sustainability principles, including the identification of principles and parameters for development on the site;
- Transportation and access context, including the strategic transport proposals in the area and the proposed access and movement options within the site;
- Urban Framework, development content of the masterplan including the identification of possible land uses, such as the local centre, key worker and market housing, academic and research facilities and a hotel;
- Evolution of the masterplan, reflecting on feedback from the November workshops and how the masterplan has changed over the past 6 months; and
- The next stages of the project, towards the outline planning application.

First workshop session: Themed Discussions based on topic areas and site specific issues

2.8 Following the consultant presentation the participants were divided into four smaller discussion groups to focus on the key issues for the site and the masterplan response. The groups were asked to identify the key issues and then summarise their results and feedback to all participants. Summaries of the outputs of each of the groups are provided below. The groups were asked to consider the following; contextual issues, site issues, opportunities, constraints and what key issues still need to be considered as part of the masterplan, prior to submission of the outline planning application. The sections below highlight key feedback from each of these groups.

2.9 Transport

- Site will need to be self- sustaining and viable
- Limited car parking only works if public transport is good
- Wider cycle and pedestrian routes required, focus outside of the site for cycle and pedestrian links as well as internal links.
- Public rights of way, bridleways and linkages are important and connections will be promoted wherever possible, ensuring that these routes and access ways are fit for purpose.
- Consideration of the impact of the development of NWC on the wider network (Huntingdon & Madingley Roads)
- Consideration of movement across key junctions (to/from West Cambridge, Girton, Storeys Way/Madingley Road).
- Importance of travel planning for overall site- car sharing, car clubs, electric cars, incentives to cycle; relation to phasing of the site in order to encourage sustainability from the outset to establish early travel patterns.
- Cycle links and appropriate cycle storage facilities will be provided, taking into consideration both the local authorities' cycle parking requirements.
- Importance of Links to South Cambridge and Science Park, and NIAB and the secondary school.

2.10 Landscape (including ecology)

- Importance of habitat connectivity and links to green corridors
- Impact of A14 upgrades, how this affects the scheme, will be considered where possible
- Flood risk assessment – intention that all water to be captured onsite – need to take into account different ground conditions (gravel versus clay); further soil investigation to be undertaken.
- Recreational requirements for the site (playing pitches, allotments) changing rooms required for sports and these should be located near the school.
- Careful consideration of Storey's Field given SSSI, topographical, ecological issues, although potential to interpret landscape
- More noise modelling required. Noise attenuation near M11 difficult due to level changes- spoil could create noise attenuation, possible combination of different options physical, planting, mounding, etc. Consideration of air quality issues.
- SUDs – Consider maintenance in the long term. Look at lessons learnt on existing SUDs for correct way to integrate SUDs into development alongside other uses i.e. cycleways etc.



2.11 Sustainability

- Queries regarding why Code for Sustainable Homes 6 could not be implemented earlier, response was that actually the onsite energy is the same for Code for Sustainable Homes Levels 5 and 6, it is the off-site contributions that vary.
- Importance of future proofing technology - Orientation of blocks- consider now issues around passive solar design, lighting requirements, requirements of commercial buildings.
- Critical mass opportunities, consideration alongside energy strategies for West Cambridge.
- Overall Energy Strategy: phasing - Energy Centre/CHP will be modular, adding to it over time
- CHP (assessment of a range of fuel sources, including biomass, refuse derived fuel and gasification)
- Energy from waste – some support, but there may be constraints on fuel sources that may mean this is not possible
- Importance of making the site exceptional and world-leading in terms of sustainability.
- Link sustainable elements on site to education in the primary school, use the energy centre to educate and challenge peoples habits/views
- Ground source heating – Queries over how efficient it would be in practice
- Sustainable transport – no drop off at the school, will encourage alternative ways of getting to school
- Innovate, adapt, look at monitoring.
- Got to be green. Trust technology.



2.12 Urban form (design quality)

- Landscape
 - A considerable proportion of the planning application area will be green space, and some space within the development footprint will be retained as open space.
 - Playing fields on NWC will specifically meet the needs of the new NWC residential community.
 - Issue with impact of school playing fields on Storey's Field, particularly if fenced off.
 - Potential acoustic benefit of landscape treatment of Western edge
- Movement through site/across site
 - Ridgeway, cycle and pedestrian route, will be attractive, tree-lined entryway to site.
 - Car parking- on plot, shared parking
 - Emphasis on different provision to West Cambridge (undercroft/ground)
 - Car clubs needed – evidence base required
 - Substantial pedestrian/cycle routes
- Character
 - Consideration of community facility provision, linked to provision in wider area, early delivery of facilities.
 - Accent developments would be of benefit - Importance of trying to capture a sense of Cambridge and uniquely Cambridge.
 - Phasing of development is key, community facilities will be built alongside residential
 - High design quality is very important – need to see it included in design codes
 - Avoid creating sterile halls of residence
 - Community facility – need to consider ownership/maintenance
 - Hotel – Public accessibility of facilities (gym/bar) Community should be able to access all facilities

2.13 As many of the key principles and parameters of the scheme had been detailed at the previous consultation, the key issues and opportunities mainly related to detailed information on community and recreational facilities. There are however, still concerns over traffic into and out of the development and how this will be tackled, how the landscape treatment will work in practice and the importance of the quality and density of the development.



2.14 Drawing from the outputs of the first breakout session, the issues raised were collated into four themed groups and participants chose which themed workshop they wanted to attend in the afternoon session. The focus for the facilitated group discussion was on 'major interests' in the site. The breakout groups were arranged to explore the following themes: Local Centre, Open Space (Storey's Field, Western Edge and other public spaces), Creating Neighbourhoods and Streetscape, Ridgeway and wider connectivity.

2.15 Creating Neighbourhoods

- Storey's Field
 - Based on Newnham Croft and Accordia; emphasis on family housing
 - Most attendees happy with design, detached family housing on edges, gardens backing onto gardens, apartments onto open space
 - Potential to locate some community facilities, would help neighbours get to know each other better
 - Nursery – consider a small cafe/meeting place
 - Small play area – in one of the green fingers of development
- Local Centre
 - Much greater proportion of apartments, successful collegiate community, more key work workers, fewer families; different social experience.
 - Concerns about area becoming too much of a University campus/ghetto – do not let this occur.
 - Phasing – ensure community facilities are in place as housing goes in, to provide sustainable communities. University will be front-loading the provision of community facilities.
 - Desire for design to fit with surrounding area

2.16 Local Centre

- Vision and main objective- to create a centre that will help to facilitate a socially cohesive quarter where town and gown will coexist together.
- Range of cultural/community uses- library, doctors' surgeries, shared spaces- possible shared use of faith services. Community facilities must be accessible to all. Management to avoid conflicts – timing/access/restrictive use
- Relationship of community building to school needs clarification
- Servicing for hotel and supermarket – conflicts with cycle route
- Consider indoor sports provision and evening/entertainment activities in flexible spaces
- Parking – should not be under control of supermarket



2.17 Open Space

- SSSI- no tree planting or hard pathways
 - Impact of sports pitches
- Ridge & furrow field
 - Protected landscape
- Location of school, sharing of playing fields, impact on open space
- Masterplan needs to recognise links to wider countryside
- Consider width of ecological corridors
- Design codes for routes, servicing and infrastructure

- Central Open Space (Storey's Field)
 - Query hotel location. Visitors not necessarily interested in open space
 - Community centre needs to be better integrated with market square and open spaces of Storey's field
 - Informal amenity space on plateau
 - Travellers Rest Pit: ecological, natural features
 - Links to school and local centre
 - Improving legibility and providing tranquil & quiet walking routes
 - Better links on Storey's field to east of Primary school

Western Edge

- SUDS and Balancing ponds
- Large scale Ha-Ha
- Sound mitigation, use materials excavated on site to establish Ha-Ha (for pockets of calm)
- 2 sided landscape – looks different from M11 than from development
- Noise is a big consideration
- Noise barriers – to create tranquil and open space
- Linkages to countryside
- Wildlife sanctuaries (for water voles etc)
- Provision for children to play in ponds
- Consider allotment locations

2.18 Streetscape and Ridgeway

- Vision is people travelling actively and safely in a community that is largely self-contained for travel needs on network of footways and cycleways (that may be combined)
- Ridgeway: cycle and walking route
 - 20m wide, opportunities for something imaginative
- Streetscape
 - Consider restriction of vehicle speeds on straight routes.
 - Should cycle and bus routes be combined (many attendees thought not)
 - How to accommodate 10,000 cycles and 8,000 cars
 - Tree management – rootballs of trees
 - Haul road strategy – off Madingley road; consider layout within site to avoid conflicts with pedestrians and cyclists on site



Key Issues to be considered as part of the masterplan, prior to submission of the OPA;

Key issues highlighted by stakeholders that will be incorporated into the masterplan proposals where possible are outlined below. Many of the key principles had been detailed at the previous consultation, and resolved, and therefore the key issues and opportunities discussed mainly related to detailed information on community and recreational facilities. There are however, still concerns over traffic into and out of the development and how this will be tackled, how the landscape treatment will work in practice and the importance of the quality and density of the development.

2.19 Key issues identified in the stakeholder workshop 'break out' sessions can be summarised as follows:

- **Urban form** Development of distinct neighbourhoods – nature of community provision in each; importance of design quality, exemplars, gateway into Cambridge, 'accent' buildings, design codes.
- **Transportation** high quality public transport, through routes, internal speed limits, cycleways, bridleway.
- **Community/Community Facilities:** Consideration of locations (within the local centre area) for hotel/community centre/supermarket, Links to NIAB, community facilities – address access/ ownership/ maintenance, sports & recreation strategies, encourage sustainable travel to the primary school.
- **Energy/Sustainability/Waste:** High standards (Code/BREEAM), CHP – (with consideration of a range of fuel types), links to school for educating purposes, future proof technology, consider integration with adjacent sites.
- **Landscape and Open Space:** Importance of ecological corridors, SUDs, links through Central Open Space, importance of Ridgeway, noise mitigation measures through landscape strategy.

3 Public Exhibitions

Summary of the Public Event

- 3.1 A public exhibition was held on both Tuesday 29th June 2010 and Saturday 3rd July 2010 to provide an opportunity for local residents and all interested parties to view the masterplan in parallel with the stakeholder workshop.
- 3.2 These exhibitions were designed to allow the public to view how the masterplan has responded to many of the points raised during the last round of consultation in November. It is important to note that since the November consultation many local groups are now represented on various forums, such as the University's Development Community Group which allows local people who have an interest to receive regular updates as the development progresses. The University's website www.nwcambridge.co.uk also provides regular updated information about the scheme. The exhibitions were therefore intended to provide information for any of those residents or interested parties who were not yet already involved or informed about the scheme.
- 3.3 On Tuesday 29th June the exhibition was held at Murray Edwards College, close to the North West Cambridge Site. The exhibition was open from 5pm through to 8pm. Approximately 30 people attended on the 29th. On Saturday 3rd July the exhibition was held at the University Centre in Mill Lane in the town centre and was open from 10am to 5pm. Approximately 40 people attended on the 3rd July.
- 3.4 On each of the exhibition days, feedback forms were available, so that those attending could comment on the masterplan. A series of general questions relating to the exhibition boards were posed. The questions were designed to encourage a broad spectrum of views. Thirteen feedback forms were received over the two exhibition sessions.
- 3.5 In addition to those people who attended the public exhibitions, many residents chose to access information via the website instead. During the main consultation period, from 28th June through to 15th July, the website received 480 extra visitors over and above normal visits during that period.



Questions Asked

3.6 The questions asked on the feedback form were as follows:

Q1 - Are you broadly supportive of the masterplan as presented in the exhibition?

Q2 - What are your views on the transport plan, in particular, the aim of providing alternatives to using private cars?

Q3 - What are your views on the sustainable goals of the development?

Q4 - What are your views on the various open spaces provided?

Q5 - Is there anything you would particularly like to see included within the community facilities we are proposing?

Q6 - Do you think there is a good mix of different uses on the site?

Q7 - Do you have any specific issues that you would like us to consider?

Overview of the 13 responses and issues raised (NB not all respondents answered all questions)

3.7 The Masterplan

Are you broadly supportive of the masterplan as presented in the exhibition?

The majority of respondents were broadly supportive of the masterplan – 8 of those who chose to respond to this question said they were in support. One had reservations concerning the loss of open space but said the plan 'is less bad than I feared'. 3 respondents chose not to answer this question. 2 respondents said they were not supportive of the current masterplan.

3.8 Transport

What are your views on the transport plan, in particular, the aim of providing alternatives to using private cars?

Of those who responded to this question 8 responded positively to the transport plan, with 3 using the words 'good idea' in relation to the alternatives proposed. Some issues raised included:

- Public transport needs to be more user-friendly particularly the explanation of different bus routes
- Need to minimise burden on existing infrastructure
- Concern about increasing congestion on Huntingdon Road
- The design is now becoming 'too anti-car'
- Concern that the good intentions will be maintained/carried through

4 respondents did not answer this question and 1 said that there was not enough detail in the plans regarding transport provision.

3.9 Sustainability

What are your views on the sustainable goals of the development?

Of those who chose to respond to this question, 6 gave a positive response, 5 gave no response and 2 gave negative comments.

Responses included: one respondent suggested that the scheme become a 'showcase for sustainability', another said that the sustainability proposals were 'just spin...to keep the chattering classes happy'.

3.10 Open Spaces

What are your views on the various open spaces provided?

7 of those who responded gave a positive answer –whilst raising certain issues:

- Need for sporting facilities
- Concern that the smaller spaces may feel 'suburban and hemmed in'
- Important that water should be included in the open space

The other respondents were either ambivalent (5) or negative (1) towards the open space provision

3.11 Community Facilities

Is there anything you would particularly like to see included within the community facilities we are proposing?

Respondents listed a number of community facilities that they would like to see. Several were keen to stress that the community facilities promised must actually be implemented. Desired facilities included:

- Sports pitches / tennis courts
- Pub serving food
- Library
- Health Centre which can also be used by local villages
- Cafes
- Places to socialise' without the need to go into the city centre'
- Small traders
- A mini-bus to run between university departments

3.12 Mix of Uses

Do you think there is a good mix of different uses on the site?

Of those who responded to this question, 7 gave positive responses to the mix of uses proposed, 5 respondents were ambivalent and 1 gave a negative response. Issues raised included:

- Would the senior citizen accommodation be open to all members of the public or just former University staff
- Local housing should be mixed with student housing
- The more open space the better

3.13 Other Issues

Do you have any specific issues that you would like us to consider?

The final question is designed to allow respondents to raise any other issues that they had not mentioned. These included the following:

- Increase bus services to other parts of Cambridge and improve the quality of bus services
- Ensure there is plenty of provision for cyclists
- Query over flood lights at the recreation areas
- Can junction 12 on the M11 be changed to allow access/exit in both directions?
- Concern at Increase of traffic on A1303 at peak times
- Concern at Madingley Road access being too close to Park and Ride access
- Should be opportunities for self-builders not just developers

4 Conclusions and Next Steps

- 4.1 This report provides an overview of the consultation process that took place in June and early July 2010, conducted by the consultant team on behalf of the University of Cambridge.
- 4.2 This further stage of consultation with stakeholders and the public has given stakeholders and the wider community an opportunity to contribute to the further development of the masterplan. The aim of this consultation was to achieve the following:
- Review a preferred option which will form part of the outline planning application;
 - 'Refresh' the principles and parameters of the Masterplan;
 - Identify any outstanding concerns
- 4.3 This report has summarised the above, the outcomes of the stakeholder workshop and public exhibitions held by the University of Cambridge, in order to inform the proposals for the North West Cambridge site. Based on the feedback from the workshops and public exhibition, the consultant team will continue to work with the University to test and refine the masterplan and its components. The next steps for the scheme are as follows:
- Ongoing engagement
 - Technical working groups with Cambridgeshire County Council /Cambridge City Council/South Cambridgeshire (with others feeding in)
 - University engagement through the Summer/Autumn/Winter
 - Masterplan development
 - Distilling messages from consultation to respond to feedback from stakeholders and the wider public within the masterplan proposals, where possible.
 - Maintaining a dialogue
 - Regular updates via the North West Cambridge Website and newsletters
 - Statutory consultation as part of the outline planning application in early 2011
 - Outline Planning Application
 - Refine application 'parameters' that will form the basis of the application
 - Test impacts of the scheme, alongside cumulative impact of other nearby developments
 - Submit Outline Planning Application (early 2011)

5 Appendices

- 5.1 Stakeholder Invitees (by organisation)
- 5.2 Stakeholder Workshop participants from client team
- 5.3 Stakeholder Workshop participants
- 5.4 Stakeholder Workshop notes
- 5.5 Public feedback comments

Appendix 5.1: Stakeholder Invitees (by organisation)

ALFRED FRENCH & SONS	CAMBRIDGE & SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE PRIMARY CARE TRUST
ANGLIAN WATER	CAMBRIDGE TRANSPORT FORUM
BAR HILL PARISH COUNCIL	CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS NHS FOUNDATION TRUST
BAR HILL RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	CAMBRIDGE WATER COMPANY
BAR HILL CHURCH	CAMBRIDGESHIRE WILDLIFE TRUST
BULSTRODE GARDENS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	CAMPAIGN TO PROTECT RURAL ENGLAND, Cambridgeshire Branch
BARTON CLOSE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	CASTLE COMMUNITY ACTION GROUP
BISHOP OF ELY	CHURHILL COLLEGE
BISHOP OF EAST ANGLIA	CHURCH OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD
BISHOP OF HUNTINGDON	CLERK MAXWELL ROAD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
BURSARS COMMITTEE	COLLEGES COMMITTEE
CABE	COTON PARISH COUNCIL
CAMBRIDGE BADGER GROUP	COUNTRYSIDE AGENCY
CAMBRIDGE BA T GROUP	CREW
CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL	CRONC
CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	DOWNING COLLEGE
CAMBRIDGESHIRE CONSTABULARY	EAST OF ENGLAND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (EEDA)
CAMBRIDGESHIRE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	EAST OF ENGLAND NHS
CAMBRIDGE CYCLING CAMPAIGN	EDF ENERGY NETWORKS
CAMBRIDGE FEDERATION OF WOMENS INSTITUTES	ENGLISH HERITAGE
CAMBRIDGE FRIENDS OF THE EARTH	ENGLISH NATURE
CAMBRIDGE FUTURES	ENVIRONMENT AGENCY
CAMBRIDGE GREEN BELT PROJECT	FITZWILLIAM COLLEGE
CAMBRIDGE GREENPEACE GROUP	FOXTON PARISH COUNCIL
CAMBRIDGESHIRE HORIZONS	GIRTON COLLEGE
CAMBRIDGE MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS	
CAMBRIDGE PRESERVATION SOCIETY	

GIRTON PARISH COUNCIL	RSPB
GIRTON PLANNING ACTION GROUP	RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION
GO-EAST	SENIOR TUTOR'S COMMITTEE
GOUGH WAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	SHAPE EAST
HASLINGFIELD PARISH COUNCIL	SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
HIGHWAYS AGENCY	SPORT ENGLAND (EAST REGION)
HISTON PARISH COUNCIL	STAGECOACH CAMBRIDGESHIRE
HUNTINGDON ROAD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION (HURRA)	STOREYS WA Y RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
IMPINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	SUSTRANS
INSTITUTE OF ASTRONOMY	SWAVESEY PARISH COUNCIL
MADINGLEY PARISH COUNCIL	TAVISTOCK ROAD AND STRATFIELD CLOSE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
MILLINGTON ROAD AND MILLINGTON LANE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	THE 19-ACRE FIELD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
NATURAL ENGLAND	THE TRAVELLERS REST PUBLIC HOUSE
NEW PINEHURST RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	TRAFFIC INTERNATIONAL
NHS CAMBRDIGESHIRE	TRANSPORT 2000
NORTH NEWNHAM RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	WEST CAMBRIDGE PRESERVATION SOCIETY
OLD PINEHURST RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	WINDSOR ROAD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
ORCHARD PARK COMMUNITY COUNCIL	
ORCHARD ROAD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	

Appendix 5.2: Stakeholder workshop participants from the client team

The following members of the client team attended the Workshop:

CLIENT

University of Cambridge

Roger Taylor, Project Director
Paul Milliner, Planning Officer

WORKSHOP FACILITATOR:

AECOM Design + Planning

CONSULTANT TEAM

AECOM Design + Planning

Charlie Ledward
Heather Topel
Jonathan Rose
Helen Inman
Kyle Morrison
Hardik Pandit
Tom Smith
Ailsa Gunson

Maccreeanor Lavington

Richard Lavington
Anna Tenow
Douglas Adhern

Wilkinson Ayre

Ayman El Hibri

AECOM Sustainable Development Group

Sam Archer
Andrew Turton

Turner and Townsend

Adrian Howell

Peter Brett Associates

John Hopkins

Communications Management

Paul Barnes
Owen Morris
Stephanie Winteringham
Sarah Peasley

Appendix 5.3: Stakeholder Workshop Participants

The assistance and keen participation shown by all stakeholders and public exhibition attendees during the course of the event is gratefully acknowledged.

Attendance list for Tuesday 29th June 2010 workshop

Name	Organisation
Bob Dawson	19 Acre Field Residents Association
Lawrence Greene	19 Acre Field Residents Association
Tony Brotchie	Castle Community Action Group
Mervyn West	Windsor Road Residents Association
John Ash	Girton Parish Council
Norman Lightfoot	Tavistock Road and Stratfield Close Residents Association
Kate Paterson	CRONC
Chris Peckett	Cambridge City Council
Eleanor Simpson	Cambridge City Council
Glen Richardson	Cambridge City Council
Liz Bisset	Cambridge City Council
Mark Parsons	Cambridge City Council
Cllr John Hipkin	Cambridge City Council
David Bradford	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Douglas de Lacey	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Roger Hall	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Mike Mason	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Jo Mills	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Trevor Faulkner	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Chris Heaton	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Elly McKee	Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Ted Hawkins	Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Patrick Joyce	Cambridgeshire County Council
Peter Duthie	Cambridgeshire County Council
Rob Lewis	Cambridgeshire County Council
Gary Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Jon Finney	Cambridgeshire County Council
Stuart Clarke	Cambridgeshire County Council
Kathy Baldwin	Cambridgeshire County Council
Gerry Corrance	Cambridgeshire County Council
Susan Cook	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Lucy Nethsingha	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Belinda Brooks-Gordon	Cambridgeshire County Council

Phillip Clark	Cambridgeshire County Council
Sandy Shatlock	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	Cambridgeshire County Council
Ian Burns	NHS Cambridgeshire
Ian Dyer	Cambridgeshire Highways
Edward Byam-Cook	Madingley Parish Council
Geoff Bruce	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Carolin Gohler	Cambridge PFF
David Taylor	Cambridge PFF
Prof. Peter Lanshoff	Cambridge PFF
Bridget Hodge	Cambridge PFF
Susan Jourdain	Cambs Campaign for Better Transport
Sian Williams	Cambridgeshire Wildlife trust
Peter Hayler	University of Cambridge Chaplain
Reverend Dr Tony Barker	East of England Faiths Council
Revd Tim MacQuiban	Methodist Church
Derek Nicholls	Methodist Church
James Ford	EDF Energy Networks
Karen Wardle	A French and Sons
Stacey Brereton	Anglian Water Services
Dearbhla Lawson	Go East
David Grech	English Heritage East of England
Janet Nuttall	Natural England
Adam Ireland	Environment Agency
Dale Greetham	Sport England
Rohan Wilson	Sustrans
Martin Garratt	Greater Cambridge Partnership
Roger Cutting	Cambridgeshire University Hospitals

Appendix 5.4: Stakeholder Workshop notes

29th June 2010

Breakout Groups (morning):

• Landscape

- Impact of A14 upgrades
- Countryside/Rights of Way network
- Cycle/links to countryside/nearby villages
- Drainage- how water affects catchment area for Wash Pit Brook→ not just volume, also flow
- Water use within site- consider flow of water across site (to balancing ponds, allotments)
- Flood Risk Assessment→ intention that all water to be captured onsite, take into account different ground conditions (gravel versus clay); further soil investigation to be undertaken
- Sports provision: need changing rooms nearby
- Provision near school- how to link changing provision (safety, access, etc)
- Difficult to provide changing facilities for smaller areas of sports provision
- Formal sports provision should be public, not collegiate. Not designed in a way that makes people think they can't use them
- Drainage: veteran tree, how impacted? Surrounding green space needed.
- Linkage of drainage with SUDs standards
- Maintenance of SUDs in longer term
- SUDs corridors seem narrow alongside other uses (cycleways, etc)→ look at lessons learnt from elsewhere
- Western Edge has higher 'ornate' value. Closer to M11 more naturalistic
- Noise: difficult to attenuate due to topography & gas mains
- AAP does not include noise barrier
- Eastern part of Western Edge is a bit quieter- is that acceptable, does it deliver high quality green space provision?
- Excavations from site construction will be used to create some of the noise barriers and will be phased alongside housing.
- More noise modelling required to achieve quality recreation environment
- Ridge and Furrow- not accessible green space, but tended as smaller farm/animals, borrowed landscape
- Buffer zone around P&R, how to connect with overall site
- Foul water- where pumped to, how would it work? Can it be used within the site?
- Split rain water & sewerage piping advisable
- Integrate with strategic study of flooding in Cambridge
- Geological SSSI- no ground disturbance possible, but potential to interpret in landscape
- Is pond at base of SSSI feasible? Could the amphitheatre be reintroduced?
- Desire lines through green space needed, not over formal sports areas
- Viewing point opportunity? Use land form?
- Habitat connectivity & links of green corridors (street trees, but need more)

• Urban Form

- Landscape
 - Substantial proportion of the planning application area will be green space; and some space within development site is retained as Green Belt
 - How will college use of green space change existing college sports provision in Cambridge?
 - Playing fields on NWC specifically to meet the needs of the new NWC residential community
 - Floodlit pitches to be in field west of Park and Ride
 - Potential acoustic benefit of landscape treatment of Western Edge
 - Impact of school playing fields on Storey's Field, particularly if fenced off
- Movement through site/across site
 - A14- impacts on NWC and on NIAB
 - Car parking- on plot, shared parking
 - Emphasis on different provision to West Cambridge (undercroft/ground)
 - Car clubs- but need some proof

- Making development cycle friendly, residents need easy access to bikes rather than hiding them away and making them difficult to get to Ridgeway w/ fingers of access to get over roads, 2 additional crossing points of Huntingdon Road (but need to consider impacts on vehicle movement on Huntingdon Road, particularly in peak periods)
 - Substantial pedestrian & cycle routes (not pinched)
 - Character
 - 'Accent' developments would be to benefit of site/Cambridge
 - Energy centre- what does that mean? Size, type of energy, what will it be?
 - Development of 3 neighbourhoods, nature of facility provision in each of the neighbourhoods (incl. nursery provision at hub of neighbourhoods)
 - Phasing of development is key, including primary school (3FE→ as development is built out, consider nature of provision)
 - Impact of size of supermarket- in terms of traffic impacts, impacts on other commercial opportunities on NWC also need to be considered
 - High design quality, but need to see what is included in design codes and what is required of developers
 - Interest in retaining 'small' number of developers to maintain vested interest in longer term
 - Look elsewhere in Cambridge for links between residential and academic clusters
 - Potential for post-doctoral college?
 - Avoid creating sterile halls of residence
 - 850sq.m. Community Facility- need to consider ownership, maintenance/management, access, partnership (incl. faith groups)
 - Level of commitment from University in terms of quality is crucial, need to see how it plays out
- **Transport**
 - NWC is integral part of city of Cambridge
 - Site will be self-sustaining and viable
 - Cycle path/link to NIAB (and secondary school)
 - University key workers will work on all University sites (but potentially mainly NWC and West Cambridge?)
 - Limited car parking only works if public transport is good
 - Opportunity to create exemplar site
 - Supermarket will assist in local shopping, limiting trips to other supermarkets in Cambridge
 - Cycle & public transport link between NIAB, NWC, West Cambridge, Chesterton Sidings?
 - Wide cycle routes
 - Cycle links to Madingley & Girton
 - Safe pedestrian and cycle routes to schools
 - Consider underground/undercroft car parking
 - Electric vehicles/car clubs/car sharing should be promoted
 - Links to South Cambridge & Science Park
 - Some routes in site restrict emergency service access
 - A14 might result in changes to site
 - Cumulative impact of noise/noise attenuation where A14 goes past Girton is not a model to follow
 - Too few car parking leads to parking outside of site (ie near West Cambridge and Addenbrookes)
- **Energy & Sustainability**
 - Code levels- why not Code 6 from the outset? Difference between 5 & 6 is minimal. Need Level 6 from 2016. Onsite energy is the same with off-site contributions
 - Future proof technology
 - District heating (what about cooling?)
 - CHP: modular approach, adding to it over time
 - Energy from waste- supporters, but constraints on fuel sources- don't want to build a facility around one energy source that don't have ability to deliver (and potential circuitous routes)
 - Waste from site- what about underground storage? Transport impacts?
 - EEDA "plugged in places"
 - Energy storage- respond to behavioural demands
 - Link to school- use energy centre to educate, challenge people's habits/views
 - Trading energy- is that a marketable product? Who is the intended audience?

- Government ideas: smart meters, restricted hours on fridge/freezers- impact on house prices?
- What is the vision? Standing out in the future
- Innovate, adapt, look at monitoring
- Ground source heating- how efficient?
- Use kids to get buy-in, educate their parents
- Mix the community
- Community facility should be flexible, wide variety of uses
- Activities and events, how to make it work?
- Gateway into Cambridge
- Green can be distinctive
- Sense of Cambridge: green, cycle, not always defined by buildings
- Western Edge could become a wasted area- how to get people into that space? Activate the area
- Co-housing could help mixing
- Homes for life
- Transport- if no drop off area at the primary school, will encourage alternative ways of getting to school
- Dedicated public transport/cycle priority routes
- Local centre- use it for local trips as well
- Key vision: beyond good practice. Link in storing energy
- Got to be green. Trust technology.

29th June 2010

Breakout Groups (afternoon)

Creating Neighbourhoods

- Storey's Field
 - Based on Newnham Croft & Accordia; emphasis on family housing
 - Most reasonably happy with design, detached family housing on edges, gardens backing onto gardens; apartments onto open space
 - If possible to have community facilities in the area, would help to make community function better, for neighbours to get to know each other better
 - Nursery- potential for meeting place/coffee shop?
 - Small play area (in green finger)
- Local Centre
 - Much greater proportion of apartments; successful collegiate community- more key workers, fewer families; different social experience
 - Facilities in easy reach
 - Concerns about area becoming too much of a University campus/ghetto → need to integrate with the rest of the community
 - Phasing: ensure that community facilities are in place as the housing goes in (don't want lots of people in the housing before facilities are being built); University front-loading
 - How to prevent buy to let investments for market housing?
 - Desire for design to fit in with surrounding area

Local Centre

- Vision & Main Objective: to create a centre that will help to facilitate a socially cohesive quarter where town and gown will coexist together
- Community building must be accessible to all; management must be undertaken so conflicts avoided on timing/access/restrictive use
- Hotel with public face on all 4 sides; relationship to Storey's Field may be an issue if privacy desired
- Relationship of community building to school to be clarified
- Community facility- if to be used by faith groups, to be engaged at early stage due to potential for specific requirements
- Parking: should not be under control of supermarket
- Servicing for hotel & supermarket- conflicts with cycle route?
- Emergency access to PCT to be addressed
- Community building should have community trust to ensure buy-in
- Use S106 contributions for cross-subsidy of facilities at early stage?
- Need for entertainment facilities?
- Where is indoor sports provision and how much?
- Are there other facilities that may be lacking?
- What provision might be in secondary centres?
- Look at lessons from West Cambridge provision of facilities
- Need for large and small buildings for nursery and pre-school provision with playspace
- Need to use one building for pre-school and out of school club provision, also breakfast clubs
- Large company ownership of nursery provision but pre-school are small voluntary committee lead provision by the community.

Streetscape & Ridgeway

- Vision: People travelling actively and safely in a community that is largely self-contained for travel needs on network of footways and cycleways (that may be combined)
- Ridgeway: cycle and walking route
 - 20m wide, opportunities for something imaginative
- Streetscape
 - How to keep vehicle speeds below 20mph on straight routes?
 - Should cycle and bus routes be combined? No...
 - How to accommodate 10,000 cycles versus 8,000 cars?

- Bins on streetscape- potential for communal bins
- Tree Management- rootballs of trees
- Haul road strategy: off Madingley Road; consider layout within site to avoid conflicts with pedestrians and cyclists within site

Open Spaces

- Who adopts routes?
- Will green corridors be wide enough?
- How to control speed on commuter routes through green spaces
- Design code for routes, servicing and infrastructure
- Storey's Field
 - Why is hotel there? Visitors not necessarily interested in open space, not direct overlooking/surveillance→ only one stretch of housing with overlooking
- Community centre: better integrated with open spaces of Storey's Field and market square
- Consider ownership
- Community input into market square (nr supermarket)
- SSSI: paths should not damage it
- Distinctiveness & character of open spaces, clear differences between Storey's Field and 'Washpit Green' (Western Edge)
- Links with wider countryside- masterplan needs to recognise opportunities
- Allotments: why next to M11 and not in 'Girton Gap'? Relationship between pitches vs allotments on edge
- Uses of green spaces: anticipate lots of young people as University Quarter
 - Learn from current green space users in Cambridge
- Better green link on Storey's Field to east of Primary School
- Circular routes through green space in Western Edge
- Washpit Green
 - Noise is big consideration
 - Look at noise barriers to create tranquil and open space
 - Linkage with countryside
- Green Infrastructure Strategy (CH collecting database of info to inform LPA strategies)
- Will green spaces be busy given site population
- Wildlife sanctuaries (water voles)
- Fitness trail through Western Edge
- Provision for children
- Sports hall/community centre/hotel use by community?
- Community hall: size and use of smaller rooms

'Post It' notes

- Need to ensure joined up green travel plans for NWC and NIAB, to encourage better use of sustainable transport Wheelie bins are more environmentally friendly than underground passages/flows for waste disposal
- All cycle and footpaths need low level solar powered lighting. Not street lights.
- Cycle parking area lights should not cause light pollution on to residential!
- If this is to be an exemplar, in the heart of Cambridge, you need to change mindset and drive down car parking in the design. Build in alternatives such as car clubs, car share, electric plug in points for electric cars.
- School site should incorporate space for a pond and space for growing veg – sustainability on site
- Early discussion on providing 5m adequate cycle and pedestrian routes over green space
- Early details of residential and on street cycle parking including a central cycle park like grand arcade
- Ensure that cycling routes are continuous. This means direct links to adjacent developments e.g. NIAB. Doglegs and offset crossings of Huntingdon road are not acceptable.
- Need to identify equestrian use of bridleways, not just pedestrian and cycle route.
- Need to identify 'Rights of Way' as planning constraints
- How will signals at Huntingdon road accommodate Pegasus crossing? What is effect on traffic modelling?
- Many features encourage reduction of crossings over Huntingdon road:
- Interruption of 30mph main traffic
- Noise (noise and safety)

- Need for large and small buildings for nursery and pre-school provision with playspace
- Need to use one building for pre-school and out of school club provision, also breakfast clubs
- Large company ownership of nursery provision but pre-school are small voluntary committee lead provision by the community.
- Security on walk from bus stop
- Owing to distances it would be better not to control parking very strictly but to remove car parking from the city centre sites
- Not appropriate to have community sport or sports pavilion on primary school sites
- Concerns were raised by the residents of Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) on the following:
 - (i) the bus service along Huntingdon Road for use by residents living between Huntingdon and Histon Roads;
 - (ii) access for pedestrians, cyclists and cars between the NW Cambridge Development and the NIAB and NIAB extra developments;
 - (iii) facilities for the two sites, whether shared or duplicated (e.g. educational facilities for all ages including adult education, health services, libraries, meeting rooms for all age-groups, sports and other leisure facilities for all age groups, pre-school children, school-age children, teenagers, adults and the retired).

Appendix 5.5: Public exhibition feedback

Q1 - Are you broadly supportive of the masterplan as presented in the exhibition?

Yes

No - I would need a much more in-depth explanation/justification in order to be convinced.

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

I wish it were not happening since I value the open space, but since it has to happen, the plan is less bad than I feared.

Yes

Not really.

Q2 - What are your views on the transport plan, in particular, the aim of providing alternatives to using private cars?

This is a good idea. Too much car usage could have a negative impact on the traffic on the A14 and local roads also.

The encouragement of alternatives is to be welcomed - one of the biggest encouragements could be increased congestion, however.

Not enough detail.

Good

Public transport needs to be much more user friendly. Just discovered uni4 service becomes city4 on Saturdays - and the two alternate round uni sites during week - not explained by bus co.

Important to ensure minimum extra burden on existing infrastructure.

Alternatives to private cars are essential but I am still seriously concerned about increasing the existing congestion on Huntingdon Road.

Why does everyone hate cars (except their own)? The design is becoming too anti-car.

Nice idea. But don't know how you will be able to maintain it.

Q3 - What are your views on the sustainable goals of the development?

Yes

Would not sustainability have been better served without the development? Was this analysis carried out?

Good

Sound good - no knowledge

Again, important to achieve. Esp for water use.

Please make this a showpiece of sustainability. That would be some compensation for the loss of the space.

Just spin (but necessary spin to keep the chattering classes happy).

As above.

Q4 - What are your views on the various open spaces provided?

Well provided with local open spaces. Important not to compromise on open space. Need for sporting facilities.

It's good that they are there, but I expect they will feel suburban and hemmed in.

Good

Good. It is close to Coton countryside reserve - are you talking to Cambridge PPF?

Sensible balance.

Good. The more the better, especially water, which always enhances green space.

Looks ok.

It is an open space at the moment, why alter that?

Q5 - Is there anything you would particularly like to see included within the community facilities we are proposing?

Some kind of sports pitches, tennis courts. Possible football pitch.

No.

No, this is fine.

A pub (which also provides meals)

Will the health centre cater for local villages also - will be closer for Coton say than Comberton & Cambridge

Perhaps a library for non university residents and visitors

Cafes, places for people to socialise without having to go into the city centre.

I'm not going to live there so have no opinion. I just want all the buildings to be high quality.

It would be less of an impact on the roads if the university were to supply a mini bus that circulated between departments.
More choice for small trading.

Q6 - Do you think there is a good mix of different uses on the site?

Generally happy with this aspect. Would like to see local housing mixed more with graduate student housing. A local pub and cafes needed.
Looks very good.

Yes

Yes. Will senior citizens accommodation be for public, or only retired univ. Personnel?

Yes

The more open space, the better (think what we're losing!)

Yes.

No.

Q7 - Do you have any specific issues that you would like us to consider?

Reduce the car usage and increase cycling and much improve local bus services to other parts of Cambridge - subsidised wherever possible to reduce the need for car usage.

The future - can't the university maintain it's position without building?

Cambridge Cycling Campaign

1. Definition 'quality bus service'.

2. Flood lights for recreation area xxx car parking for evening

Can junction 12 on the M11 be changed to allow access/exit in both directions?

Heavy traffic at peak times particularly on A1303. Will this increase? Could you contribute to traffic lights at Coton Turn crossroads? It is difficult to turn right from Coton or Madingley. Madingley Rd entrance to site is very close to park & ride. T lights would need to be coordinated or could both entrances be from one roundabout?

I am very concerned about the larger amount of traffic passing up and down Huntingdon Road, which is already jammed on occasions.

Self-build should be allowed. Instead of handing off all the detached house plots to builders, auction them off to individuals.

Concerned at loss of university ownership.